Reply to Office Action of June 12, 2006

Docket No.: SON-2898

REMARKS

This Amendment is in full and timely response to the initial Office Action on the merits of the invention, as mailed on June 12, 2006. Reexamination and reconsideration are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any suggestions for placing this application in even better form, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Preliminary Amendment filed on December 6, 2004

While not specifically acknowledged in the Action, it was assumed that the Second Preliminary Amendment filed on December 6, 2004 contained the amended claims as considered in the initial examination. Accordingly, those claims are here presented as the basis for this amendment. Acknowledgement of the entry of that paper with the allowing papers is respectfully requested.

Drawings

It is further assumed that the drawings as filed with the application on January 21, 2004 (not January 12, 2004) are accepted, notwithstanding the absence of a specific indication in section 10 of the Office Action Summary.

Priority Claim

It is noted with appreciation that the priority claim and the submission of all of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Information Disclosure Statement

Finally, it is also acknowledged with appreciation that the IDS submitted on May 12, 2004 has been considered as shown by the initialed Form PTO-1449 that accompanied the pending Action.

Claims

Claims 1 to 10 were pending in this application as amended and presented for the initial examination. Claims 8 to 10 were allowed, while claim 2 was merely objected to as containing

Application No. 10/760,404 Amendment dated August 2, 2006 Reply to Office Action of June 12, 2006

allowable subject matter but dependent on a non-allowed base claim. Without indicating acquiescence in or agreement with the rejections, claim 1 is amended to include the subject matter of allowable claim 2, and claims 3 to 6, dependent directly or indirectly on amended claim 1, are retained as shown.

Claim 6, when dependent on amended claim 1, was objected to as substantially duplicative of claim 4, also dependent on amended claim 1. Claim 6 is thus amended to be dependent on claim 3 in turn dependent on amended claim 1. Thus, the objection to claim 6 as presented is overcome.

Rejected claim 7 is canceled, for if it were amended with the subject matter in method form of allowable claim 2, it would be substantially duplicative of allowed claim 8.

Allowed claims 8 to 10 are retained as previously presented.

Accordingly, claims 1, 3 to 6, and 8 to 10 are allowable at least for the reasons indicated by the examiner, and early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SON-2898 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 2, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By / Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC Correspondence Customer Number: 23353

Attorney for Applicant

6